

Maturity deposit scheme of JVG

3192. SHRI SURYABHAN PATIL VAHADANE: Will the Minister of FINANCE be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that JVG Foods Limited had in the year 1995-96 collected crores of rupees under the maturity deposit scheme and had issued postdated cheques for refund of the money on the stipulated dates;

(b) whether it is also a fact that the cheques have been dishonoured by the bank for insufficient funds and the claimants have registered FIRs;

(c) if so, what action has been taken to apprehend the culprits and refund the money to the depositors; and

(d) what percentage of the deposit would be reimbursed after liquidation of assets and by when?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI BALASAHEB VIKHE PATIL): (a) to (d) As per annual accounts of the company as on 31.03.1996, the company has not accepted fixed deposits. However, the company had accepted share application money amounting to Rs. 9,51,16,900/-. Several complaints against the company were received regarding non-payment of investments. It was found that M/s. JVG Investment (a partnership firm) had accepted funds for issue of shares on behalf of M/s. JVG Foods Ltd. The complaints were referred to the company which were returned undelivered. Prosecutions have been filed against the company and its' directors under section 146, 159 and 220 of the Companies Act, 1956. The Company Law Board is seized of the matter and they have made a reference to Commissioner of Police, New Delhi since the whereabouts of the directors of the company are not known.

Dismantling of Monopolies and Restrictive Trade Practices Commission

3193. SHRI NANA DESHMUKH: Will the Minister of LAW, JUSTICE AND COMPANY AFFAIRS be pleased to refer to answer

[22 August, 2000]

RAJYA SABHA

to Unstarred Question 1035 given in the Rajya Sabha on the 1st August, 2000 and state:

(a) whether it is a fact that a Committee was set up by the Central Government to prepare Competition Law Policy and has *inter-alia* recommended dismantling of the Monopolies and Restrictive Trade Practices Commission;

(b) whether it is also a fact that trade practice related cases would henceforth be taken up by a new authority to be known as Competition Commission of India;

(c) if so, what are its salient features; and

(d) how it would be beneficial for Small-Scale Sector?

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING AND MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF LAW, JUSTICE AND COMPANY AFFAIRS (SHRI ARUN JAITLEY): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) to (d) The Committee set up by the Central Government, known as the High Level Committee on Competition Policy and Law, has recommended that the Government should formulate a Competition Policy and implement the same through a new law (the Competition Act).

The Committee has *inter-alia* recommended establishment of an independent Authority (to be known as the Competition Commission of India) to look into and adjudicate on matters relating to anti-competitive behaviour like abuse of dominance, mergers/amalgamations that might lead to abuse of dominance and agreements between enterprises that could lead to or has led to anti-competitive behaviour.

It has also recommended the repeal of the Monopolies and Restrictive Trade Practices Act, 1969 and winding up of the MRTP Commission.

The Government has circulated the Report widely among the general public, the State Governments/Union Territories and the Central Ministries/Departments and has sought opinions and suggestions.

The Government is yet to take any final view and it would do so after examining all aspects, including its impact on the Small-Scale Sector, in due course.

Enhancement of rate for registration of companies

3194. SHRI R.P. GOENKA: Will the Minister of LAW, JUSTICE AND COMPANY AFFAIRS be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have received any representation for withdrawal of the recently enhanced rate of fee payable for registration to the Registrar of Companies under Schedule X of the Companies Act, 1956;

(b) whether it is a fact that the fes have been raised without any rationale, and or improving the quality of services provided by the offices of the Registrar of Companies in keeping with changing environments; and

(c) if so, the main contentions of representationists and the action taken thereon?

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING AND MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF LAW, JUSTICE AND COMPANY AFFAIRS (SHRI ARUN JAITLEY): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) The fees has been revised after careful consideration. The present revision has taken place after (08) eight years. With the revision of fees, the Department has been able to give better services to the companies like immediate availability of names, faster registration of documents etc. This has been made possible by modernising and computerisation of the offices of Registrar of Companies.

(c) As per Notification No: SO 658(E) dated 12.7.2000, the company has to pay higher fees on prospective basis. This step has been welcomed. The said Notification was issued on the basis of careful consideration of various representations received by the Government.